

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/836,976	04/18/2001	David W. Conrad	00RE098	9060	
759	90 10/10/2003	EXAMINER			
Alexander M. Gerasimow			SICONOLFI, ROBERT		
Rockwell Automation (Allen-Bradley Co., Inc.) 1201 South Second Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Milwaukee, WI			3683		
		DATE MAIL ED: 10/10/2003			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

(5	1	_

	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
Advisory Action	09/836,976	CONRAD ET AL.						
Advisory Addion	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Robert A. Siconoffi	3683						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 29 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.								
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]								
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.								
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:							
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or								
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	S.					
NOTE:								
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment					
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		idered but does NO	T place the					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	to issues which were	e newly					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-27</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
3. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.								
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
10.☐ Other:		Robert A. Sconolfi Examiner Art Unit: 3683	Mi 19463					

18

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues the references separately and the bodily incorporation of McCarthy into Marshall. The examiner disagrees with these arguments.

Applicant also argues that the McCarthy lacks elements for which it is not being relied upon. A teaching reference does not have to disclose every limitation of the claim just that which it is used to teach.

Furthermore, the applicant argues that Marshall teaches away from McCarthy. The examiner strongly disagrees. Marshall does not discuss a cam and therefore does not directly teach away from use of a cam. Secondly, Marshall does not state that a large lever is desirable (nor even discusses the size of the lever) and therefore does not directly teach away from wanting a compact device. Additionally, the examiner sees no inference in Marshall that a large device is preferred over a smaller one. Therefore, the examiner concludes that Marshall, contrary to the assertion by the applicant, does NOT teach away from the cam device of McCarthy.